



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,232	03/02/2004	Daniel C. Robbins	MS307308.1/MSFTP593US	3653
27195 7590 09/14/2007 AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			EXAMINER NGUYEN, JENNIFER T	
			ART UNIT 2629	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/14/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
osteuball@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/791,232

Applicant(s)

ROBBINS ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is responsive to amendment filed on 06/27/07.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9-13, 16, 20-22, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by anticipated by Igarashi et al. (Patent No.: US 6,747,680).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention “by another,” or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Regarding claims 1, 11, and 20, Igarashi teaches an advanced navigation system for portable device comprising:

an input component (802, fig. 8) that receives user input, the input component comprising a pointing device;

a navigation component that facilitates navigating through content displayed on a portable device screen (804) based in part on location of the input component with respect to the content; and

a mapping component that smoothly transitions a current view to a new or previous view and orients the content and/or the view thereof within the portable device screen based in part on data received from the navigation component, the mapping component continuously adjusts magnification of the content based at least in part on the speed of the input component with respect to the content (col. 8, line 56 to col. 9, line 5, col. 10, line 40 to col. 11, line 7).

Regarding claim 2, Igarashi teaches the current view comprising an overview of the content (col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 30).

Regarding claim 4, Igarashi teaches the pointing device comprises a stylus (col. 10, lines 40-48).

Regarding claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 16, and 21-22, Igarashi teaches the mapping component displays a less detailed/a more detailed view of the content underlying a faster/ slower moving pointing device (col. 7, lines 20-40).

Regarding claim 9, Igarashi teaches the portable device comprising a PDA (col. 11, lines 29-36).

Regarding claim 10, Igarashi teaches comprising document-based content, image-based content, map-based content, and calendars (col. 12, lines 20-28).

Regarding claim 26, Igarashi teaches a computer-readable medium having stored thereon the components of claim 1, wherein the components are computer executable (col. 12, lines 21-28).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 7, 14, 15, 18, 23, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Igarashi et al. (Patent No.: US 6,747,680) in view of Baar et al. (Patent No.: US 6,768,497).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Regarding claims 3, 14-15, 23 and 24-25, Igarashi does not specifically teach a semi-transparent overview of the content over at least a partially zoomed in view of the content to maintain or provide context.

Baar teaches a semi-transparent overview of the content over at least a partially zoomed in view of the content to maintain or provide context (col. 6, lines 1-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the partially zoomed in view of the content as taught by Baar in the system of Igarashi in order to display region of interest clearly to the user.

Regarding claims 7 and 18, the combination of Igarashi and Baar teaches a lens component integrated into the device screen that is maneuvered over the content in part by the input component (col. 6, lines 1-10 of Baar).

6. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igarashi et al. (Patent No.: US 6,747,680) in view of Davies (Patent No.: US 6,262,741).

Regarding claim 19, Igarashi does not specifically segmenting the content displayed on the portable device screen into at least two sub-segments.

Davies teaches segmenting the content displayed on the portable device screen into at least two sub-segments (col. 8, line 62 to col. 9, line 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the sub-segments as taught by Davies in the system of Igarashi in order to view easily.

7. Claims 8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Igarashi et al. (Patent No.: US 6,747,680) in view of Baar et al. (Patent No.: US 6,768,497) and further in view of Rodriguez et al. (Patent No.: US 6,704,034).

Art Unit: 2629

Regarding claims 8 and 17, the combination of Igarashi and Baar does not specifically teach the view of other surrounding content displayed on the device screen does not change.

Rodriguez teaches the view of other surrounding content displayed on the device screen does not change (col. 5, lines 16-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the view of other surrounding content displayed on the device screen does not change as taught by Rodriguez in the system of the combination of Igarashi and Baar in order to allow the user view the other area efficiently.

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion


Art Unit: 2629

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7696. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard A. Hjerpe can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jennifer Nguyen
3/26/07



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600